REMARKS

Status of the Claims

Claims 1, 4-5, 7-8, 11-12, 14, 17-18, 20, 21, 23, and 24 are currently present in the Application, and claims 1, 8, 14, 21, 23, and 24 are independent claims. Claims 1, 4, 8, 11, 14, 17, 21, 23, and 24 have been amended, claims 2-3, 6, 9-10, 13, 15-16, 19, 22, and 25 have been cancelled, and no claims have been added.

Examiner Interview

Applicants note with appreciation the telephonic interview conducted between Applicants' representative and the Examiner on October 5, 2006. During the telephonic interview, the Examiner and Applicants' representative discussed the 102 reference (Abdelhak, U.S. Patent Pub. 2005/0097190). In particular, Applicants' representative discussed that Applicants' invention sends a page of data and a data collector program to a user's client, and non-invasively collects data using the data collector program without user interaction. In turn, Applicants' invention identifies configuration preferences based upon the user event data, and stores the configuration preferences for future use. In contrast, Abdelhak does not teach or suggest using a data collector program to non-invasively collect user event data, but rather teaches a user to select which configuration preferences to store from a menu. The Examiner suggested amending Applicants' independent claims to include the limitations of dependent claims 2 and 3 in order to possibly read over the art of record. The Examiner also suggested specifying the location in which the configuration preferences are stored in order to overcome the 101 rejection to Applicants' independent claims. Applicants have made such amendments in this response.

Drawings

Applicants note with appreciation the Examiner's acceptance of Applicants' formal drawings filed concurrently with the application.

Claim Objections Under 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 1, 8, and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicants have amended claims 1, 8, and 14 to distinctly claim the location in which configuration preferences are stored. Therefore, Applicants request the removal of the 101 rejection to claims 1, 8, and 14.

Claim Rejections - Alleged Anticipation Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Abdelhak (U.S. Patent Pub. 2005/0097190, hereinafter "Abdelhak"). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

As discussed with the Examiner, Applicants have amended independent claim 1 to include the limitations of original dependent claims 2, 3, and 6. As such, amended independent claim 1 is directed to a method including the limitations of:

- receiving a page request from a user's client, the page request corresponding to a page of data;
- retrieving the page of data and a data collector program;
- sending the page of data and the data collector program to the user's client;
- receiving user event data corresponding to the page of data, the user event data non-invasively collected at the user's client using the data collector program;
- identifying one or more configuration preferences based upon the user event data;
- sending a storage inquiry to the user, the storage inquiry corresponding to the configuration preferences;
- receiving a storage response, the storage response corresponding to the storage inquiry;
- determining whether a user session corresponds to the user's client;
- in response to determining that the user session corresponds to the user's client, sending the configuration preferences to the user's client in response to the determination, wherein the user's client is adapted to store the configuration preferences in a client storage area; and

- in response to determining that the user session does not correspond to the user's client, storing the configuration preferences in a local storage area.

As amended, claim 1 claims "*sending the page of data and the data collector program to the user's client*" and "*receiving user event data corresponding to the page of data, the user event data **non-invasively collected** at the user's client **using the data collector program**.*" In contrast, Abdelhak discloses sending a requested page of data (with no data collector program) and instructs a user to select which configuration preferences to store. The Office Action uses an excerpt from Abdelhak to reject Applicants' "non-invasive" limitation. After further review, however, the excerpt specifically states user-invasive steps:

> "Continuing with the flowchart in FIG. 8, in step S206, **the user uploads** personal content to personal portal information processor 12 for use in respective personal Internet portal page 52....If the user so desires, **he selects** the layout for content uploaded in step S206...In step S208, **the user defines** a portion of his personal Internet portal page to contain information regarding the user's email accounts. Further, **the user defines** a series of hotlinks to be displayed..." (page 6, para. 70, emphasis added).

As can be seen from the above excerpt, Abdelhak depends upon invasive user interaction to perform data collection steps, which is different than non-invasively collecting user event data using a data collection program as claimed by Applicants. In short, Applicants' invention collects user event data (e.g., keystrokes, mouse clicks, etc.) using a data collector program and, in turn, identifies configuration preferences based upon the user event data. Abdelhak merely provides a menu to a user for the user to select configuration preferences.

Therefore, since Abdelhak does not teach or suggest, in whole or in part, each of the limitations of claim 1 as amended, amended claim 1 is allowable over Abdelhak. Claim 8 as amended is an information handling system claim including similar limitations of amended claim 1 and, therefore, is allowable for at least the same reasons as amended claim 1 is allowable. Claim 14 as amended is a program product claim

including similar limitations of amended claim 1 and, therefore, is allowable for at least the same reasons as amended claim 1 is allowable. Claim 21 as amended is a method claim including similar limitations of claim 1 and, therefore, is allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1 is allowable. Claim 23 as amended is an information handling system claim including similar limitations of claim 1 and, therefore, is allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1 is allowable. Claim 24 as amended is a program product claim including similar limitations of claim 1 and, therefore, is allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1 is allowable.

Each of the remaining claims 4-5, 7, 11-12, 17-18, and 20 is dependent, either directly or indirectly, upon one of the allowable independent claims 1, 8, or 14. Therefore, each of claims 4-5, 7, 11-12, 17-18, and 20 is allowable for at least the same reasons as their respective independent claims are allowable.

Conclusion

As a result of the foregoing, it is asserted by Applicants that the remaining claims in the Application are in condition for allowance, and Applicans respectfully request an early allowance of such claims.

Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner contact the Applicants' attorney listed below if the Examiner believes that such a discussion would be helpful in resolving any remaining questions or issues related to this Application.

Respectfully submitted,

By   /Leslie A. Van Leeuwen, Reg. No. 42,196/
Leslie A. Van Leeuwen, Reg. No. 42,196
Van Leeuwen & Van Leeuwen
Attorney for Applicant
Telephone: (512) 301-6738
Facsimile: (512) 301-6742